

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 were examined, all of which stand rejected. Claim 1 has been amended, and Claims 2 and 9 are canceled.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0063671 to Knapp (“Knapp”).

Claim 1 is patentable over Knapp because it recites that “... one of the first gate lines and one of the third gate lines are simultaneously scanned and the second gate lines are after the first and the third gate lines” As described, for example on page 6, lines 15-29 of the subject Application, the gate-on voltage is applied simultaneously to the first gate lines ($G_1 - G_{n-x-1}$) and the third gate lines ($G_{n+x+1} - G_m$) sequentially. Then, the gate driver applies the gate-on voltage to the second gate lines ($G_{n-x} - G_{n+x}$). This differs from Knapp, where data signals are applied to rows 1-K and to rows K+1 to M alternately (Knapp, paragraph 22). Knapp’s FIG. 3 shows that rows 1-K correspond to the “first gate lines” recited in Claim 1, and that rows K+1 to M correspond to the “third gate lines” recited in Claim 1. Thus, in Knapp, the first gate lines and the third gate lines are *not* scanned simultaneously – they are scanned alternately.

In Knapp’s embodiment of FIG. 3, the active periods of column driver circuits 35A and 35B overlap slightly while rows K to K+x are being addressed (Knapp, paragraph 29). However, as Knapp’s rows K to K+x would correspond to the “second gate lines” in Claim 1, the second lines would not be “scanned after the first and the third gate lines” in this case. Knapp’s second gate lines would be scanned at the same time as the first and the third gate lines. For these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Knapp.

Claims 3-5 depend from Claim 1 and are thus patentable over Knapp for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 2 and 6-15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knapp in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,136,040 to Park et al. (“Park”).

Park is not a proper prior art for this Application because it is a prior art under 35 USC 102(e) that is assigned to the same entity as the subject Application (Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd.) 35 USC 103(c)(1) states:

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Based on the above, the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) based on Knapp and Park is moot.

Claims 2 and 9 are canceled and their elements are written into Claim 1. Claims 6-8 and 10-15 are patentable over Knapp and Park.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-15 are now in condition for allowance. The Directory is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2257. Please telephone the undersigned attorney at (408) 392-9250 if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

MacPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEID LLP

Dated: Feb. 7, 2008

By



Kieun 'Jenny' Sung
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 48,639

MacPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEID LLP
2033 Gateway Place, Suite 400
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 392-9250
Facsimile: (408) 392-9262